

## Draft Individual Review Form

**Proposal number: 2001-I201-1**

**Short Proposal Title: Watershed Education**

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Objectives – educational; not scientific/ecological

Data needed to test – very limited information about current problems.

Hypothesis – environmental education will lead to understanding, appreciation, and maintenance of water systems. Presumes general public will not value results of data if they're not involved in the collection of it.

**1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Scientific component built into approach but not clear about purpose of bird surveys (not specific to species of concern). Grassland mapping and exotic control and re-vegetation clear but not specific as to which species trying to restore. Not strong connection to Delta system. Data analysis not fully described.

**1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

**1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Adaptive management approach. Limited use regarding effectiveness of past research and restoration projects funded by CAL FED that applicant wants to continue. Mapping and eradication of invasive plants has plan for continuity.

**1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

**2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Limited scientific monitoring (only on grass planting). No description of method/tool to use for assessing change in participants appreciation and understanding.

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

**3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Educationally feasible. More curricular description for field activities and more detailed video description is desired. Time allotted okay except video production timeline seems too short unless much stock footage exists. Video seemed disconnected to rest of project.

**4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Fine for educational tasks. Adequate for scientific and habitat management tasks using the expertise of partners.

**Miscellaneous comments**

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

---

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☒ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

---